

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-29. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29 are amended herein, and new claim 30 is added. No new matter is presented. Proper support for the amendments can be found at least on page 25 lines 4-9 and FIG. 2 and corresponding text.

Thus, claims 1-30 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):**

Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,236,802 (Yamamoto).

Yamamoto displays selected video segments of a video recording to a user designating points associated with the video segments in the editing process (see, col. 4, lines 42-46, col. 5, lines 24-32). In Yamamoto, a user selects near-in-points and near-out-points associated with a respective video segment designated by the user for editing and the selected near-in-points and near-out-points are stored without storing the full said video segments (see, FIG. 3 and corresponding text). Accordingly, Yamamoto is limited to effecting edits to selected segments at once and storing the segments.

The present invention, however, includes “changing a parameter value ranging from a value of a start point to a value of an end point gradually as time elapses” (claims 1, 8, 15 and 22). For example, as a user changes a parameter value of image data (i.e., saturation in FIG. 2), a user is able to preview the effects of the change as the change is implemented gradually (see, FIGS. 2, 3 and 8).

Independent claim 8, by way of example, recites “changing a parameter value ranging from a value of a start point to a value of an end point gradually as time elapses” and “establishing the parameter value when detecting the user’s indication as a parameter value related to the target data.” Independent claims 15 and 22 also recite similar features.

Independent claim 29 also recites, “adjusting a value with respect to image data or sound data based on an input parameter ranging from a value of a start point to a value of an end point gradually” and “indicating a time-based adjustment of the image data or the sound data as the value thereof is adjusted gradually.”

Yamamoto does not teach or suggest the above-discussed features including “changing” or “adjusting” a parameter value “ranging from a value of a start point to a value of an end point gradually”, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 5, “said output unit simplifies and thus outputs the target data” and “said output control unit has the simplified target data outputted based on the parameter value that is to be changed.” The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claim 5 (see also claims 12 and 19 reciting similar features).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-137832 (Kikuchi) and U.S. Patent No. 6,154,601 (Yaegashi).

Kikuchi is directed to setting hitting position of a mobile object in a game system using topographical information. However, Kikuchi is limited to providing scenery information of a scenery based on height and luminance data to assist a user in understanding a game space (see, Abstract).

On the other hand, Yaegashi is directed to displaying an editing position of video information on a screen according to a command from a user designating a frame/scene to be edited (see, col. 8, lines 15-23).

Kikuchi and/or Yaegashi do not teach or suggest, “adjusting a value with respect to image data or sound data based on an input parameter ranging from a value of a start point to a value of an end point gradually” and “indicating a time-based adjustment of the image data or the sound data as the value thereof is adjusted gradually”, as recited in claim 29.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIM:**

New claim 30 recites, “changing a parameter value with respect to an image data” and “providing an animation of the image data effecting time-based variations... including minimum

and maximum values of the parameter value and states of the image data prior and subsequent to said changing.”

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, “providing an animation of the image data effecting time-based variations... including minimum and maximum values of the parameter value and states of the image data prior and subsequent to said changing”, as recited in claim 30.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 30 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 07/19/2006

By:   
Temnit Afework  
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501